Christianity and Society

Marxism and Christianity

A Symposium by

Paul Tillich

and

Eduard Heimann

SPRING 1942 **25 CENTS**

Volume 7 Spring 1942 Number 2

CHRISTIANITY AND SOCIETY

A Quarterly devoted to Christianity and Social Reconstruction
PUBLISHED BY THE FELLOWSHIP OF SOCIALIST CHRISTIANS

CONTENTS

EDITORIALS: Page

Chastisement unto Repentance or Death 3
We Recommend St. Augustine to "The Christian Century" 5
Our Inadequate Congress 7
Russia and the Peace 8
Stafford Cripps and India 9
Better Government Than We Deserve 10
Taxation and Inflation 10
Workers and Soldiers 11
The Future of Our Journal 11
Fellowship Meeting 12

Marxism and Christian Socialism, by Paul Tillich 13
Socialist Christians Reconsider Marxism and War, by Eduard Heimann 19
Defense Is Not Enough, by Clifford L. Stanley 27
The Religious Foundations of Populism, by Marvin Halverson 31
Book Reviews 37

EDITOR
REINHOLD NIEBUHR

EDITORIAL BOARD
EDUARD HEIMANN CLIFFORD STANLEY RICHARD DAY A. T. MOLLEGEN
WINNIFRED WYGAL HARRY BONE ROSE TERLIN ARNOLD NASH

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE FELLOWSHIP OF SOCIALIST CHRISTIANS
NORMAN SIBLEY EDUARD HEIMANN RICHARD DAY WINNIFRED WYGAL
HERMAN REISSIG REINHOLD NIEBUHR JAMES ROBINSON
ELEANOR BRANNAN CHARLES ARBUTHNOT

Subscription Rate: $1.00 per year; 25c per copy
4 Shillings per year in England
Published Quarterly

Business Address: 3041 Broadway, N. Y. C.
Editorial Secretary: Martha Hutchison
English Agent: Alan Richardson, Annandale, North End Road, London, N. W. 11

CHRISTIANITY AND SOCIETY

Volume 7 Number 2

ditorials

astisement unto Repentance or Death

t is now apparent that we are in for ong war. The Axis has been able to n so many points of strategic advan-, while we are still in the process of ing, that only long and costly mili- and naval operations can overcome, regain what we have lost. It is in quite likely that in another six nths our nation will confront one of most momentous decisions of its his-. At that time we may be in the tion of having been defeated essen-y, except of course that we cannot defeated absolutely as France was. t means that we will have the possi-y of rescuing victory from defeat vided, we are willing to pay the price. ether we understand the conse-nces of capitulating to, or conniving a Nazi world sufficiently, to be ready ay the price of victory is a question ch is not yet decided. It is quite ious that the superficial unity, eved by the Pearl Harbor attack, is ty well dissipated now. The isola-ists are beginning to come out of r storm cellars. We can expect a y strong propaganda in favor of a otiated peace, should we continue to er further military reverses. The rmination to carry on can certainly be generated out of interpretations of the war, which assume that we are at war only because we were attacked by the Japanese. Only if we understand this war in its profound revolutionary setting is it possible to generate the will to fight it to its final conclusion. For only then can we see how important it is to overcome the revolt against our civilization; and how equally important the inner renewal of our civilization is.

Isolationists liberals have believed, and still believe, that we must not strain the resources of the democratic world too much, that we must not submit it to too strenuous exertions, lest it suffer some kind of apoplectic stroke and die as France died. This is a counsel of despair, which assumes that democratic civilization is a very sick old woman, whose life would be endangered by any exertions beyond the sick room. If our civilization is as sick as that, it would of course die in any event, whether it exerted itself or not.

The experience through which we have already gone in a few months of belligerency suggests a different thesis about the relation of our war efforts to democracy. The thesis is that only the chastisements of a fairly long war can prompt a really thoroughgoing repentance and conversion, from those sins of the democratic world, which helped to

produce the Nazi revolt against our civilization. We were much too soft and fat, much too heedless and indifferent to the ultimate issues of life to be changed by the only casual chastisements of a brief belligerency. This is not to say that war as such is the only possible source of repentance to nations. We must think not abstractly but historically about these questions. When we are guilty of sins which make a revolt against civilization possible, we can hardly repent of those sins until bitter experience has taught us what the consequences of the sins are and by what kind of sacrifices and change of heart the evils we have done can be overcome.

How for instance can the sins of national irresponsibility, by which the democratic nations invited aggression, be overcome? They are overcome partly by learning how terrible are the consequences of an international anarchy, which we aggravated by our effort to escape from it into our own continental security. They are overcome partly by forms of international cooperation which the exigencies of war force upon us and which we would not accept, except under the pressure of necessity. It is idle, for instance, for idealists to wash their hands of the war and then speculate upon what kind of a system of international cooperation they will be able to build. The constitution of the United States grew out of the experience of the revolutionary war, in which the inadequacies of colonial particularism were glaringly revealed and the necessity of the abridgement of state sovereignty became apparent.

The forms of international cooperation which we adopt during the struggle may of course be disavowed after the struggle, as we did after the first world war. But it is quite certain that they will not in any event rise higher than the level to which the pressures of war forced them.

In the same manner the sacrifices of the war will greatly reduce the inequalities of our economic system. The discipline of wartime taxation has had strong equalitarian effects upon British life and will have similar consequences in our life. The gross inequalities of capitalistic democracies are disappearing under the wartime necessity. These gains are not necessarily permanent. We must expect the privileged classes to make desperate efforts after the war to regain their imperiled position in society; and we cannot deny that these desperate efforts may imperil democracy itself. But on the other hand, it is not likely that democratic society will reach higher standards of equal justice, after the pressure of war is removed, than it achieved under the pressure of war.

In so far as one of the basic weaknesses of bourgeois society is the love of ease and the identification of civilization with the comforts and gadgets which technical achievements have made possible, the chastisements of war are, again, the primary prompting to repentance. The fact that we have lost our rubber and may thereby become bereft of our automobiles is a highly symbolic form of chastisement for all of the most characteristic sins of bourgeois life. For what could be a more perfect symbol of our idolatries than our automobile? If we can stand its loss, we can bear almost anything. On the other hand, there is the possibility that we might prefer to give in to the Axis rather than be without our automobiles. If fatness was our sin, the war is quite obviously making us more lean. But of course such exper-

ces in themselves do not bring re-
ıtance. There is always the possibility
t we might decide to be fat slaves
ıer than lean freemen. It is in that
se that the issues which we face in
ning months are so tremendous, and
t the resolution to continue our battle
inst external foes also involves our
ire to be quit of our internal weak-
ses, which made the revolt against
civilization possible.

In so far as democratic society was
lty, not only of sins of omission and
weakness which made the more viru-
t evils of Nazism possible, but was
o guilty of sins similar to those of the
zis (imperialism for instance), we
e the same necessity of chastisement.
lia will probably gain its freedom
ler the pressure of necessity. It
uld not have secured it, at least not
years, if the British empire had not
ne so close to defeat. The similarity
ween the white man's arrogance in the
nocratic world and Nazi race theories
pparent. If we do not repent of this
ogance, we cannot win the war. Our
peration with China and the British
peration with a free India, are fruits
te for repentance, brought forth by
rigors of war.

One could only wish that our negroes
a strategic position comparable to
t of the Hindus and the Chinese. In
t case they would win more conces-
ns from our pride then they are likely
get. Nevertheless, they are going to
some concessions, provided we are
d pressed enough to find their dis-
ection as a serious threat to our vic-
y.

Moralists may find this trait of human
ure, its grudging concessions, its un-
lingness to repent except under chas-
ment, abhorrent, and they may dream of another kind of history than the actual history of man. But if they examined their own conduct scrupulously, they would find evidences in it of this same reluctance and would learn to appreciate the tragic elements in history as manifestations of divine judgment, without which men would remain in the stupor of sin.

It must be observed in conclusion that while a long war may be the only discipline which will bring a democratic world completely to its senses, it is also possible that too long a war would make the burdens too grievous to be borne. It might drive us to despair and finally to death; which is to say that it might so aggravate the social issues through general poverty that the democratic way of life would break down under the tensions created by this general poverty and exhaustion.

We are thus in the position of going through an ordeal which may make or break us. We do not know what the residual health of our world is. We do not know how much punishment it can stand, or even how much it needs.

We Recommend St. Augustine to "The Christian Century"

The tortuous processes of thought and analysis in which "The Christian Century" has engaged since the outbreak of the war give one the embarrassing feeling that someone is dressing in public and that it would be more decent and discrete to let the chamber hide both the nakedness and the fumbling efforts to find the clothes with which to cover it. Yet the necessities of journalism make this impossible. If the storms, fires, and tumults of history suddenly prove the garments of a simple Christian moralism

to be inadequate for an understanding of our world and our duties in it, the requirements of a publication schedule make seclusion, until the proper new clothes have been found, impossible.

The embarassment of "The Christian Century" would be unimportant if it did not reveal the confusion of the Christian church in America so accurately. Here is the microcosm through which we can study the macrocosm of the church.

There are several points in the "Century's" position which deserve a special word. Its position is in fact a tight rope. It seeks to find a tenable point between belligerency on the one hand and pacifism on the other.

It believes first of all that Christians must accept the war as a tragic necessity, as a "hell" of punishment, which must prompt them to repentance. But it is certain that there must be no discriminate judgments in this repentance which would make distinctions between aggression and defense, between the remnants of a civilization and revolt against it. Thus it seeks to preserve continuity with its pre-war position in which it refuses to make distinction between "British imperialism" and Nazism. It is interesting how on this question, as on others, a rather fatuous moralism reaches conclusions identical with Barth's radical Reformation theology, before Barth himself recanted and began to make significant historical decisions. The important point for Christians is to recognize their equal guilt in the sight of God and to throw themselves upon the Divine mercy. If such a position is held rigorously to the point of excluding discriminate judgments about justice and injustice in history, Christianity lands us in the moral perversity of condoning tyranny because there are similarities between it and sins of which we are ourselves guilty.

Furthermore, this insistence upon common guilt, obscures the fact that the "good" people and a "good" civilization must sometimes learn to understand, not the sins which they have in common with the "bad" people, but the very particular and special vices of the good, the comfortable and the respectable, which have excited and prompted the sins of the bad. If the Nazis worship force, perhaps we ought to repent because we have worshipped reason. If the Nazis worship the nation, perhaps we ought to repent of a shallow universalism which does not understand the creaturely character of man and our perennial involvement in communities, which are less than the community of mankind. If the Nazis are tyrannical nationalists, who think that their nation ought to impose its will upon other nations, perhaps we ought to repent of another kind of national selfishness, of our irresponsible nationalism which refuses to accept responsibility for world order and thus creates an international anarchy in which international tyranny can operate. If the Nazis represent an impossible collectivism, perhaps the democratic world ought to repent of an equally impossible individualism, which violates the Christian law of love just as much as a destructive collectivism.

These indiscriminate confessions of guilt obscure the very sins in our own life, which must be overcome if we would win either the right or the power to survive. They also obscure the moral obligations which prompt us to withstand particularly vicious forms of revolt against the community of mankind.

After destroying all moral distinctions which might justify us in standing against

zi aggression, "The Christian Cen-
y" arrives nevertheless at a half-
rted belligerency. The basis of this
sition is a rather pathetic loyalty to the
ion. It does not want Japan to de-
t us. It insists that "the church is not
war," but evidently Christians may be
war, provided they can find no better
sons for their belligerency than the
gan "Remember Pearl Harbor." We
uld be the last to deny that national
alty and piety is an admixture in the
tives of citizens of a belligerent na-
n. But if we are not fighting for some
ng better than mere national survival,
cannot fight effectively even for
t. More important, we are laying the
ndation for another renunciation of
ernational responsibility, after our im-
diate perils are overcome. We can be
rly certain that any possible peace
er the war, and any possible interna-
nal arrangements will be renounced
Christian moralists of the type of
he Christian Century." They will do
ostensibly because the peace does not
nform to the standards of the Sermon
the Mount. But mixed with this per-
tionism will be the old spiritualized
ionalism, the view of life which recog-
es piety toward the nation as an in-
table force in human life but cannot
e to a full avowal of our responsibil-
s toward a community of nations.

The third point in the position of
he Century" which deserves mention,
its belief that war represents a system
ally different from any other form of
ial reality, primarily because it in-
lves a "necessary" violation of the law
brotherhood. "The Century" in-
s that its whole position "stands or
ls" by the validity of this distinction.
is is perhaps the most pathetic fallacy
the many which the journal espouses.
War is not a "system" which can be lop-
ped off, or disavowed, just like that. War
is the final and vivid expression of all
the conflicts and antagonisms of the
overt and covert tensions which the self-
love of man, individual and collective,
introduces into human society. It is
furthermore not the only form or ex-
pression of this selfishness. The desire
of one life to dominate another (imper-
ialism and tyranny) and the desire to
live our life without concern for others
(irresponsibility and isolationism) are
other forms of this sin. One form of
self-love may invite and prompt the ex-
pression of another form; and some-
times the effort to escape one form be-
trays us into the contrasting form. The
effort to make war a special kind of sin,
the blindness which regards it as a "sys-
tem," which either can be disavowed, or
which cannot be disavowed but which
must be accepted as a "tragic necessity,"
is the ineviable consequence of Christian
interpretations of human life and human
history, which are inspired not by the
Biblical understanding of human nature
but by the fatuous eighteenth century al-
ternatives to it.

We would like to recommend to the
editors of the "Christian Century" that
they make a careful and reverent study of
Augustine's "City of God." We promise
them that they would emerge from such
a study with insights which would dis-
pel their present confusion and with
garments to cover their present naked-
ness.

Our Inadequate Congress

The Union for Democratic Action and
"The New Republic" have published a
general analysis of the achievements and
errors of the present congress, together
with detailed records of each congress-

man. This record will be of great value in guiding voters in the coming congressional election.

The situation is that we have had one of the worst congresses in our history The majority of its members have been equally inept and stupid in foreign and in domestic politics. On the Republican side all but about 30 members (the latter followers of Willkie) have pursued a foreign policy, which at its worst represented pure isolationism, and at its best was merely a stupid effort to embarrass the administration. In domestic politics the Republicans have been almost unanimous in their reactionary tendencies and in their desire to hamper New Deal legislation.

The Democratic congressmen have of course supported the President more consistently in both foreign and domestic affairs. But the better aspects of the administration's domestic policy are constantly imperiled by reason of the fact that many Southern Democrats are more reactionary in domestic affairs than their Republican colleagues. These Southerners, of whom Senator Byrd of Virginia in the Senate, and Martin Dies in the House, may be regarded as convenient symbols, are both stupid and reactionary.

When the record is carefully examined one wonders how Roosevelt has ever been able to accomplish as much as he has. But at the present moment everything decent in the administration's domestic program is imperiled, if most of these representatives are reelected. As for foreign policy, it need only be recorded that this congress came within one vote of disbanding the United States army, only a few months before we were attacked by Japan.

Russia and the Peace

There are authentic reports that Russia is making embarrassing demands upon the United Nations for immediate recognition of her territorial claims. Such recognition would of course be tantamount to secret treaties. As, after the world war, they would not see the light of day until after the war and then would present the peace makers with conditions, which might destroy a really effective new settlement.

Russia has, of course, always demanded dominion over the Baltic states. Her demands upon Poland seem not to be beyond what Poland is willing to grant, that is the fixation of the boundary at the old Kurzon line, as determined after the world war and violated by Poland. According to reports her claims upon Finland are excessive and she also wants territory in the south which will take her to the Dardenelles. Beyond that there are authentic rumors that she opposes the union of Poland and Czecho-Slovakia, undoubtedly for the purpose of preventing a strong unity in central Europe and thus dominating each one of the central European nations.

These territorial demands will not necessarily be granted and they do not represent insuperable obstacles to effective collaboration between Russia and the western world. But it must be quite obvious that America cannot resist such demands without being willing to enter into a system of collective security which makes this kind of security by territorial expansion unnecessary. In other words Roosevelt will face the same problem once more that Wilson faced with France. Which proves how important it is to settle in our own minds and conscience, what we are going to do about the whole principle of international

ponsibility. If the impulse of isolanism should overwhelm this nation second time, we will become the chief truments of world anarchy.

afford Cripps and India

Nothing in the history of the war in cent months has been more sensational an Sir Stafford Cripps' rise in the itish scene to a place of authority next Churchill's. Though neither the ry nor the Labor party machines in House of Commons have any love this ablest and most intransigent the leftists in the House of Commons, y had to give him his high position ause the public demanded it. The blic demanded it because his return m Moscow coincided with the reverses the Far East which shook the prestige the Churchill government and Cripps' nsels, delivered in a series of three io talks, appealed to the public as preting just the right program for tain. The talks alone would of course t have sufficed. In back of them was ipps' record. He was right on the two estions over which the British public s apprehensive. He wanted full coloration with Russia and dominion staus for India. Both his convictions on India question and his long friendip with Nehru made him the logical n to be given the most difficult task signed to a British statesman in years. hat his success may be is not determined as these lines are written but may known before the lines are read.

Cripps position in British life today l be of particular interest to readers of *ristianity and Society* because his radiism is completely rooted in the Christ- radical tradition, which had its rise seventeenth century England; and ich has always been more important in Britain than in any other country. Britain is in fact the only modern democracy, whose radical politics have developed inside and not outside of the Christian faith. British leftists may have learned some technical facts from Marx; and sometimes they might well have learned even more from him than they did. But they never placed leftist programs under the intolerable burden of opposition to the Christian foundations of our civilization. On the contrary they regarded their opposition to the injustices of a capitalist society as flowing logically from the presuppositions of their faith. This has been true of all the great Leaders of British labor, Keir Hardie, Robert Smillie, Arthur Henderson, George Lansbury and Stafford Cripps. Of those mentioned Lansbury and Cripps were or are Anglicans. None of them were very sympathetic toward the church as an institution. Yet all of them were Christian in more than the traditional sense.

The elevation of the Archbishop of York to the Primacy of the Church of England, reveals another side of the British picture, equally interesting. It proves to what degree even the established church embodies social thought, ready to meet with and understand the most radical protests against the inequalities of modern society. Not that the Archbishop of York would have been the choice of the clergymen of the church of England for his high office. Nor would he have been the choice of the government, but for a concatenation of circumstances, not dissimilar from those which brought Cripps to power. Only a very chastened Britain would have elected Dr. Temple to his high office. It is, nevertheless, significant that the ablest and profoundest theologian of

the Church of England should also be one of its most advanced social prophets and should now have the opportunity of exercising his gifts at Canterbury.

From the standpoint of American equalitarianism, British democracy may betray too many vestigial remnants of feudalism. But it is well to remember that some of the same tendencies in British life which have produced this curious compound of feudalism and democracy have also made it possible for a radical democracy to arise, inside and not in opposition to the Christian ethos.

Better Government Than We Deserve

It is surprising how frequently the Roosevelt administration has made more democratic proposals than those who are interested in democratic justice had the wit or the energy to support. The latest example of the failure of the larger public to support the administration is the taxation bill before congress. Secretary Morgenthau proposed an excess profits tax on all profits beyond 6%. The wealthy classes raised a hue and cry. The poorer classes did not come to the support of the administration. Labor unions have been particularly remiss in understanding the importance of the issues which are being decided in Washington. They left Secretary Morgenthau "holding the bag." The conservative finance committee of the senate informed the secretary that his proposal had no chance of passing. This was obviously true because only great public pressure would have made its enactment possible. As a consequence the proposals of the administration, as now presented, measure excess profits beyond average profits over the past years. This means that a company which made excessive profits over a sufficient number of years can now have these profits guaranteed for the duration of the war.

The inability of labor to recognize the fatefulness of the issues, which are decided in Washington, is quite alarming. The unions have not yet learned that in wartime political power supercedes economic power. Indeed we may be living in an age in which political power is gaining ascendancy over economic power, whether in peace or in war, whether in democracies or in dictatorships. The power of collective bargaining should not be abridged. But labor ought to augment its economic power with political pressure, wherever the opportunity is offered.

Taxation schedules in the next decades will have more to do with the kind of justice we achieve in our society than any other single factor.

Taxation and Inflation

It may be questioned, incidentally, whether the present tax proposals, rigorous as they are, are rigorous enough to prevent inflation. One economist recently estimated a national income of 115 billion in 1942-3, war expenditures of 55 billion, taxes of 30 billion and consumer goods available of 60 billion. This still leaves 85 billion available for savings and consumption and only 60 billion worth of consumer goods. The difference of 25 billion (Leon Henderson's estimate of the difference is only 15 billion) must be sluiced out in either further taxation, forced savings or voluntary savings on a larger scale than seems possible. If this is not done, the money in the hands of the buying public will force prices up, there being an inadequate supply of goods to meet the demands of this money.

Inflation is, of course, not avoided by this process alone. There must also be

ation of prices. On the problem of ce ceilings the President has thus far ved off the effort of the farmers to 120% above parity before they will ow their prices to be fixed. His vic- y over the farm bloc will not be se- e, however, if the highest labor prices not also fixed and if the excess profits is not made more rigorous. The latter licy is not required to prevent infla- n so much as to establish the *bona fs* of any general strategy which seeks freeze the economic status quo. The bilization of the economic status quo certainly not justice. But it seems the st way of preventing the kind of in- ion which would finally result in ater injustice to the farmer and the rker than any possible price control.

orkers and Soldiers

The campaign in congress and the untry against the forty-hour week has vealed some very typical bits of ration- ation and dishonesty. It was wise for or to sacrifice double wages for Sun- y work; and it might have been wise do this before public clamor began. t the campaign of the Manufacturers sociation was filled with dishonesty. e most dishonest part of the program s the assumption that workers were rking only forty hours a week. The ole influence of the administration on public opinion had to be marshal- to prove to the public that workers re in fact working about fifty hours r week in war industries.

The choicest bit of rationalization was e comparison between the wages of e workers and the $21 per month pay the soldiers. We suspect that there isn't a high-powered company execu- e or publicity man who spread this opaganda who was drawing less than $10,000 per year. We had the experience, while the campaign was on, of having our dentist, to whom we had just complained about his bill, giving us a lecture on the greed of workers who were not shamed into patriotism by the $21 per month of the soldiers. The dentist took advantage of us by debating with us while our mouth was gagged with his instruments. But once free we merely said, "What about you and myself doctor? Shall we make a covenant to work for only $21 per month for the duration?" The vagaries of the human mind are a constant source of amazement.

The Future of Our Journal

Rising printing costs have imperiled the future of our journal for some months past. We are happy to say however that our appeal for more aid in securing new subscribers, to cover the costs of our modest undertaking, resulted in a larger number of new subscribers, than in any previous quarter of our history. But we need another 150 new subscribers to meet the cost of our journal without subsidy. Would our readers, if interested in maintaining this journal continue to help us: (1) Send us the names of friends who might be interested in becoming subscribers if we sent them sample copies of this issue, or (2) send us gift subscriptions for your friends. (3) Ask us for extra copies of the journal which you will send to interested friends.

We have less than a thousand subscribers. But the great majority of these are very loyal friends, who have supported us for most of the seven years of our life. We will not readily abandon this journalistic enterprise, if enough people find our pages sufficiently helpful to give us their support.

Fellowship Meeting

The Fellowship of Socialist Christians held an all-day meeting on January 29th at Riverside Church, New York, the first time it has attempted that kind of a meeting. The sessions were well attended and some members came from a distance. In the morning Professors Tillich, Heimann, Mollegen and Niebuhr participated in a symposium upon the question: "In What Sense are Socialist Christians Marxists?" We are presenting two of the papers in this discussion, those by Professors Heimann and Tillich as articles in this issue.

A PRAYER

Grant us O Lord, while wars rage and kingdoms fall, so to know thy counsels and purposes for us that nothing in the world may affright us or take us by surprise. Grant us the grace to look at the sad history of our generation in the light with which Christ has illumined our darkness. So may we discern thy judgment in the confusion, and be convicted of the sins of which we and our nations are guilty; and understand thy mercies that we may be kept from despair.

As thou hast brought the sorrow of despair upon many peoples by the darkness of our day, illumine our darkness by the light of Thy gospel, that despair may turn into repentance, repentance into faith and men may know Thee, who are the sovereign of history, the master of national destinies and the judge and redeemer of all peoples. Amen.

FOR THOSE WITH WHOM WE ARE AT WAR

Most merciful and loving Father, we beseech thee most humbly to pour out upon our enemies with bountiful hand whatsoever things thou knowest may do them good; and chiefly a sound and uncorrupt mind, that they may know thee and seek thee in true charity, and love us, thy children, for thy sake. Let not their hating of us turn to their harm, neither let us in any wise hurt them, seeing that we cannot do them good for want of ability. Lord, we desire their amendment, and not their punishment. Separate them not from us by punishing them, but join and knit them to us by thy favorable dealing with them. And seeing we be all ordained to be citizens of the one everlasting city, let us begin to enter into that way here already by mutual love, which may bring us forth thither. Amen.

An Old Elizabethan Prayer.

Marxism and Christian Socialism

by Paul Tillich

Marxism never has been accepted indiscriminately and without a serious criticism by the Religious-Socialist movements. A large part of the theoretical foundation of Religious Socialism was dedicated to a thorough discussion of the doctrines of Marx and the Marxians. The result of these discussions, in the most cases, was partly a rejection, partly acceptance and an essential transformation of the Marxist teachings by leading Religious Socialists. Has this situation changed? Has the gap between Christianity and Marxism deepened, either, because Marxism has lost significance and its power to interpret present world, or, because Christianity has developed in an entirely divergent direction? There are, indeed, elements Marxism which have become obsolete, and there are developments in Christianity which tend to disrupt any connection between it and the ideas of Marx and his followers. But this does not mean that all elements in Marxism have lost their significance and that the entire Christian theology has turned against Marxism. On the contrary—it seems to that important elements of the Marxmethod of thinking are merged with theological thought to such a degree that they are not recognized any more as taken over from Marxism. This is especially true of the realistic and pessimistic interpretation of the human situation by Neosupranaturalism and dialectical theology. In order to come to a decision about this question we first must remember why and in which respect Marxism was appreciated and criticized by Religious Socialism.

I.

The Theological Appreciation of Marxism.

The main reason for the theological appreciation of Marxism is a striking structural analogy between the prophetic and the Marxian interpretation of history. This has often been carried through — also in this magazine — and needs only to be mentioned. Both, prophetism and Marxism are historical interpretations of history, that is, interpretations in which history has a meaning of its own and is not only a continuation of the general natural process or a place of preparation for the supranatural. History has an aim towards which it is running and the fulfilment of which is the meaning of every historical act. And since history has an end, it also has a beginning and an acme, a point where its meaning becomes visible and in the light of which an interpretation of history becomes possible. Both, prophetism and Marxism regard the fight between good and evil forces as the main content of history, describing the evil forces mainly as the forces of injustice, and envisaging the ultimate victory of justice. This interpretation creates in both cases an eschatological mood, a tension of expectation, a directedness towards the future which is entirely lacking in all kinds of sacramental and mystical religion. Both prophetism and Marxism attack the

existing order of society and personal piety as the expression of a universal evil in a special period. They passionately challenge concrete forms of injustice, threatening those responsible for it, especially the ruling groups, with the judgment of history and imminent destruction as the inescapable consequence of social injustice. Both, prophetism and Marxism believe that the transition from the present stage of history into the stage of fulfilment will occur in a catastrophe or in a series of catastrophical events, the end of which will be the establishment of a kingdom of peace and justice, and the symptoms of which are already recognizable for the divinatory or analytic spirit. The feeling that the catastrophical coming of the "new" is "at hand" is strong in them. Both, prophetism and Marxism, believe that certain minority groups within a selected nation or class are the real bearers of the historical destiny, that through their action the meaning of history is carried into reality. The free actions of these groups are considered as the instruments of the historical destiny. Freedom and historical destiny are not contradictory for phophetic and Marxist thinking. Mechanistic necessity as well as accidental contingency of the process of history is denied by both of them. Prophetic as well as genuine Marxist dialectics are above the level of this alternative.

The structural analogy between Prophetism and Marxism is not confined to their interpretations of history. It also refers to main elements in their doctrines of man. This is true not only of the prophetic but also the Christian doctrine of man generally. Man is not what he ought to be, his true being and his real existence contradict each other. Man is fallen, if not from an original actual goodness, at least from a stage of undeveloped innocence. He is estranged from himself and his true humanity, he has been dehumanized, he has become an object, a means of profit, a quantity of working power—according to Marx. He is estranged from his divine destiny, he has lost the true dignity of his being, the image of God, he is separated from his fellow man by pride, cupidity, and will to power—according to Christianity. Christianity and Marxism agree that the nature of man cannot be determined from above history, that man's historical existence is decisive for every doctrine of man. And they agree that the nature of man cannot be determined by the characteristics of the individual man. Man is a social being, and his evil as well as his good are dependent on his social existence. Perdition and salvation are universal and historical. The individual as a individual cannot escape the former and cannot reach the latter. He is a part of a fallen world—whether the fall is expressed in religious or sociological terms; and he can become a part of a new world—whether this new world is conceived of in terms of a suprahistorical or an infrahistorical transformation. From this follows that the idea of the truth in both, Christianity and Marxism, lies beyond the separation of theory and practice. The truth must be "done" in order to be recognized. Without a transformation of reality no true knowledge of reality is possible. The situation of knowing is decisive for his ability or inability to know. Only the "spiritual man" can judge everything, according to Paul, and only the man who participates in the struggle of the "elected group" against the class—society is able to understand the true character of being.

expressed in more concrete terms, Church or the fighting proletariat the places where truth has the great- chance to be accepted. In all the er sphere the general distortion of historical existence, it is difficult, if impossible to find a true insight into human situation and through it into ng itself. The fate of self-deception —as Marx called it—of the production ideologies—is inescapable, except in selected groups, who are predom- ntly composed of people in ultimate iety, despair and meaninglessness. the boundary of all human possibil- s the new possibility arises and gains wer. If all ideological veils are torn wn and no self-deception is possible more, truth can appear and can be ed upon. And it is revealed only in measure in which it is acted upon. e protest of the reformers against the lf-made" gods or idols and the protest Marx against the self-made ideas or ologies challenge the same spiritual nger of man in his present existence: make the truth a means of religious de or political will to power. In all se points Christianity and Marxism united in their opposition to a elagian" or "harmonistic" optimism h respect to the nature of man.

II.

e Theological Criticism of Marxism.

The basic difference between Religi- s Socialism and Marxism is rooted in ir different attitude to the idea of nscendence. There is a kind of trans- lence in Marxism: The limits of the esent possibilities of human nature are nscended by the expectation of a com- g stage of justice. A kind of miracle the transition from the present to the ture stage of mankind is presup- posed—at least implicitly. And it is obvious that Marxism draws a great deal of its psychological power from this element of transcendence and faith. But this transcendence is not the absolute transcendence of Christianity. It remains in time and space, in history and politics. It is dependent on immanent processes. It transcends the present time, but not time as such. It does not know eternity breaking into time, shaking, turning and transforming the temporal. Marxism never reaches this transcendence. It is suspicious of it. Religion, because of its supratemporal nature is considered to be an ideology, i.e., a system of ideas and symbols which have no basis in reality, but which are invented for the sake of making the misery of the disherited classes more bearable to them and, consequently, for the sake of breaking their revolutionary impulse by a mystical opiate. This is the theory of religion in original as well as in late Marxism. Obviously, this theory had to be criticized sharply by Religious Socialism. Religions of this type are distortions of what religion essentially is. This distortion is always possible and has often become a historical power in the sense in which Marxism describes it. But such a description does not fit the prophetic religion and its fight against the demonic powers of history and of the personal life. And even the "sacramental" element in religion is not simply ideology. It is also the basis of the prophetic element, because only in the power of the Holy which is present, can the Holy of the future be expected and realized. In any case, Religious Socialism follows the Christian and all great religious messages in affirming the transcendent, invisible and eternal character of the ultimate fulfilment of history and human life. History

is fulfilled above history not within history.

From this follow some basic differences between Religious Socialism and Marxism. Although Marx had fought against what he called "utopian Socialism" he himself and even more his followers did not escape dangerous elements of utopianism themselves. They did not expect, of course, that the class situation could be changed by persuasion of the ruling classes, but they did expect that the economic process in unity with the revolutionary impulse of the proletarian classes would create the fulfilment of history, the classless society in which the main evils of the earlier mankind, of its "prehistory" as Marx called it, would be overcome. Religious Socialism, on the contrary has always maintained, that the demonic forces of injustice, pride and will to power, never will be eradicated from the historical scene, although special manifestations of it, as capitalism and nationalism might be conquered. Therefore, Religious Socialism turned the anti-ideological criticism as much against itself and against all the other socialist and Marxist groups as against the enemies of socialism. The sharpest criticism of the socialist movement comes from Religious Socialism while the lack of such a self-criticism, for instance in the social-democratic parties, contributed much to their catastrophes. For the same reason Religious Socialism, contrary to Marxism, the importance of the personal life and its transformation for the revolutionary movement. The personal shortcomings of the leaders of the socialist groups and the lack of a profound education and discipline in the vanguards of the movement, is due to the immanentist attitude of Marxism, to its overemphasis on the institutional and its lack of understanding of personal factors. For Religious Socialism the corrupted human situation has deeper roots than mere historical and sociological structures. It is rooted in the depth of the human heart. And in the same way the regeneration of mankind is not possible through institutional and political changes alone, but at the same time changes in the personal attitude towards life in many people are needed. Therefore, for Religious Socialism the turning point of history is not the rise of the proletariat, but the appearance of a new meaning and power of life in the Divine self-manifestation. These differences are of a tremendous importance. But they do not exclude the inclusion of basic elements of the Marxist doctrines of history and man by prophetic Christianity.

III.

Religious Socialism and Scientific Marxism.

Religious Socialists have accepted many of the scientific results of the Marxian analysis of society, especially of economics, because they have found them to be true. And they have maintained and still maintain Marxist theories as far as they can do so on scientific grounds. They were and are, at the same time, hospitable to any criticism of Marxist ideas as soon as such criticism seems to be demanded by the progress of scientific knowledge. Religious Socialism rejects any dogmatism with respect to the Marxist principles. It subjects them to the criteria of every scientific procedure and beyond this to the methodical suspicion that they might have become ideologies themselves. But Religious Socialism rejects dogmatic Anti-Marxism as well as dogmatic Marxism,

subjects the scientific attack on the rxian doctrines not only to scientific eria but also to the suspicion of be- an ideological escape. Especially in present situation in which Marx is hed more and more into the back- und the question of ideological Anti- rxism has increased in importance.

There are above all some philosoph- principles in Marxism which can must be maintained by Religious ialism as discoveries of lasting signif- ce provided that their corrupted ms are recognized as such and re- ed. The demand of the unity of ory and practice, or, in more recent ms, of "existential thinking" is a last- insight that Marx has discovered in fight against theoretical idealism and erialism. But the distortion of this ght into a sceptical relativism accord- to which all thinking is only the ex- ssion of a special kind of being (psy- logical or sociological) must be con- red not only as a corruption, but also he negation of existential thinking. he same way it must be acknowledged Religious Socialism that Marx is right mphasizing the material reproduction mankind as the foundation of the le historical process. But the distor- of this insight into a mechanistic nomics or into a metaphysical ma- alism must be rejected. The econ- ic sphere is itself a complex sphere to ch all other spheres essentially con- ute so that they cannot be derived n it, although they can never be sep- ed from it. The dialectical method st be accepted as a method of describ- the movements of life and history in r inner tensions, contrasts and con- itions and in their trend towards e embracing unities. But the dis- ion of the dialectical method into a universal mechanism of calculable processes has nothing to do with reality and with the original meaning of this method. There are dialectical elements in all life and every historical totality, namely elements belonging to given structure which drive beyond this structure. These structures can be described only in dialectical terms but not at all in terms of mechanical necessity. Existential thinking, historical materialism and the dialectical method are achievements which never should be lost in Religious Socialism.

The same is true of several sociological and economic principles of scientific Marxism. Marx's method of analyzing economic phenomena is a sociological method: It takes into consideration, in every moment, the human and social factors, and denies the escapistic attitude of formal economics which hide the fact that economic action is human action. The recognition of this situation is the second highly important methodological contribution of Marxism. On the basis of this method Marxism has given that analysis of the contradictions of capitalistic society, which was the main stroke against the harmonistic beliefs of liberal bourgeoism. Marx himself and most of his followers confined their analysis to the contrast of "capital" and "labor." In the last decades it has become obvious that here are many more contradictory elements in the later stage of capitalism, and that the revolutionary vanguard is no longer identical with the proletariate or advanced groups within it. It has become visible that the lower middle-classes and the burocracy in state and business will play a much greater role than Marx ever anticipated. But all this does not invalidate the main point in his analysis: The insight into the contradic-

tions in the structure of capitalism. On the contrary, this insight has been deepened and confirmed by the catastrophes of the present world. Any neo-liberalistic attempt to reestablish a harmonistic interpretation of capitalistic society must be rejected by Religious Socialism. It is an obvious fact that, partly under the influence of Marxism, the economy of free competition has been restricted to a great extent by the increasing power of labor, by frequent and radical interferences of the state in all countries, by the general trend towards state capitalism and the rise of a centralizing burocracy. But this transformation, although transforming the anticipations of Marx, is, at the same time, the confirmation of his basic vision. Nobody can understand the character of the present world revolution who was not prepared for it by the Marxian analysis of bourgeois society, its contradictions and its necessary trends. It is an experience which can be made daily, that people who are lacking in Marxian education, directly or indirectly, are utterly confused by the rise of Communism and Fascism and by the present world catastrophe. They simply cannot understand the trends in the former structure of society which with dialectical (not mechanical) necessity have brought about the present situation. They explain it as the result of bad accidents created by bad men. Religious Socialism, with the tool of the Marxian analysis of society, brought up to date, is able to give a meaning to the present world revolution.

IV.

Marxism as a Lasting Principle and Religious Socialism.

It is understandable that ideas can become an element of the general consciousness to such a degree that their original significence is forgotten. Much of what they had to say and which was surprising in the beginning has become natural. Other parts have become antiquated; and so the whole system of ideas seems to belong to the past. A theory of social processes which has partly changed the actual processes may seem to have become wrong just because it was right at the time it appeared. But there are other spiritual creations, the effects of which are not exhausted by their historical successes. They have an infinite, inexhaustible meaning because they represent a lasting type of spiritual possibilities. Such types are Prophetism, Platonism and Protestantism. Such types also are Religious Socialism and Marxism. They return again and again in different shapes, based on their original, classical appearance. Therefore, we must go back to their classical form and we must reshape them in the light of actual experience. But we cannot dismiss them as merely forms of past history. They would return against our will. We cannot discuss Marxism as a movement of the past, as long as we espouse the prophetic spirit as Religious Socialists. Religious Socialism, if it is to keep any meaning and power must not become another ideological justification of the present democracies, nor must it become a progressivistic idealism and a system of autonomous harmony. The breakdown of these ideas has created the present situation. Religious Socialism, in the spirit of prophetism and with the methods of Marxism, is able to understand and to transcend the world of today.

pcialist Christians econsider Marxism and War

by Eduard Heimann

Marxist doctrine or "scientific social-" is, broadly speaking, a compound four independent currents of thought. 1.) The first element is the dialectical thod of analysis which discovers the dency of constellations of life and tory to become something beyond the its of their previous form without ing their previous identity or, at least hout discontinuity with the past. The nciple Marxist example is the dialectic free capitalism, moving from a com-itive, free, progressive system of econ-y to monopolistic big business, fetter-liberty and employment.

2) The second element, the economic erpretation of history sees history de-mined by the lust for economic power d contains elements of similarity with Biblical description of the sinful rld. An economic interpretation of tory need not be either progressive dialectical as James Madison's inter-etation is not.

3) The third element is the idea of gress, of history moving to a final har-ny. In Marxism this element is ex-essed in the concept of the "withering ay of the state," of the loss of function political compulsion in an all-prole-ian and classless community. In its urgeois form the idea of progress is rtly economic but not dialectic. It ows of no serious theses and anti-eses but thinks of history as a straight e. The Marxist theory is dialectical cause progress is achieved through con-ct to final harmony. The relation of tastrophe to progress in Marxist thought echoes the religious hopes of final judgment and salvation.

4) The fourth element, the "scientific" approach in Marxism is meant in the strictest sense of the word science. It denotes an investigation in terms of tangible magnitudes connected as natural cause and effect, and suggesting, in the application to present and future history, an elongation of present "tendencies" into a more fully developed future.

The doctrine of rational progress (3) can hardly be conceived in terms other than scientific, (4) and also the economic interpretation (2) focusing as it does on tangible things, is apt to enter into close connection with both. In Hegel the elements (1) and (3) are merged, without (2) and (4). The Marxist combination is a doctrine of history as determined by a causally inevitable economic development in its final, decisive stage is the transformation of an inoperative and conflict-torn private industrial system into a unified all-proletarian system.

The affinity to (or derivation from) Christianity is clear, and has already been suggested, in the elements (1), (2), and (3), while the element (4) is foreign to religion. To a generation indoctrinated with the belief in a bourgeois world governed by moral ideals Marxism came as a revelation of Christian truths. (1) We learned from the Marxian dialectic to realize that good may turn into evil, that they are, in a sense the same substance. (2) We learned from the economic interpretation of the bourgeois

world the realistic protest against bourgeois presumption and profitable bourgeois virtues. (3) We saw in the final vision of a forceless community, to which all history moves, affinities with the belief in the Kingdom of God and the recognition of its justice as the standard by which our society is to be judged.

No doubt, to a liberal generation disillusioned by bourgeois cant and presumption, Marxism was the way to Christian realism to a realistic application of Christian principles.

This, however, is a merely biographical observation; it does not imply that we should continue to be Marxists after having been awakened by our Marxian education.

II.

We classify some of the well-known objections to Marxism under the four previous headings.

(1) The Marxian dialectic is purely historical. This implies that any pattern of life, as it grows older, becomes bad, while the opposing new is good for the time being, in its first phase, on the strength of its historical mission. Only as it exhausts its power of achievement does it, in turn, become oppressive. The possibility of a historical force emerging in the full vigor of a historical task and being or becoming perverted in its early vigor is unknown to Marxism. Marxism itself being new and unfulfilled is exempt from self-criticism; Marxism is necessarily good, it must deny the tyrannical aspects of Communism. And what about Fascism, which is, along with Communism, a collectivized system emerging from the revolt of the masses against capitalism, in the full vigor and consciousness of the historical task? Is it not necessarily good?

A second criticism of the Marxist dialectic must be made. The Marxian dialectic admits fundamentally only two forces, two classes, old and new, past and future, had any good in every phase of history. This assumption effectively obscured any understanding of the problem of the middle classes, particularly in agriculture.

(2) In regard to the economic interpretation of history, our first question concerns the role of phophetic criticism as a historical force by which we constantly orient our actions. According to the economic interpretation, prophecy reflects and arises only from economic interest. If not, what is its source and nature?

When the economic interpretation is called upon to explain our present problems, its inadequacy can best be seen from its inability to account for the rise and nature of Fascism. Fascism is not rooted in any special economic force but rose over the economic powers to a position of overlordship over and control of them all. Arising as it does from the crisis of capitalism and using every means to establish its own unqualified power, it created a centralized economic organization which is at least halfway between those of capitalism and socialism, speaking in purely economic terms. While not abolishing private property and profit, it did subordinate them to the unifying power and thus achieved full employment, which Marxism had taught to be the monopoly of its own system. Marxism, unable to understand its nature, cannot understand its monstrosity either.

(3) The dialectical economic development is not supposed to be indefinitely progressive but to lead to the final solution of all social conflicts in the harmony

the proletarian age. In other words, proletarian movement, being the vement of the last and lowest class in tory, is not regarded as provisionally d, then gradually perverted, and ally doomed, like all preceding move- nts of history; it is definitely and abso- ely good. Not man in general is re- ded as good, as in the historical bour- is presumption, but proletarian man, final and highest product of history, necessarily good. Such presumption uld not but lead to every absurdity of gmatism, fanaticism, and self-deifica- n.

(4) That all these errors are pre- ted as sheer science makes them the re difficult to eradicate. The strict ual logic which is claimed for the velopment toward final proletarian vation reduces history to a calculable chanism in which the unpredictable ngs cannot happen. The "scientific" sis that history creates a unified prole- ian society obscures the diversification society in the era of the decay of cap- lism. That thesis makes it impossible, refore to fight the tyrannical unifica- n imposed on this diversity and to kle the positive task of democratic co- eration on the basis of this diversity. ch democratic cooperation, however, is r primary problem, domestic and in- national.

III.

There is little dissension among us out these objections to Marxism. The oblem is whether they can be met by odifying the system and removing what ul Tillich calls the "limitations," or ether these limitations are the essence, moval of which would invalidate the tire philosophy.

(1) It is logically possible to remove from the dialectic the narrow historical understanding which does not allow for human perversion of the rising force, nor for more than two antagonistic classes. We would then still preserve the insight into the dialectical character of life and history between the creative and destructive use of its power, the struggle in every historical society between the rulers and the ruled, the rich and the poor, the struggle in late capitalism for the implementation of liberty with the right to work, and the parallel struggle in the tyrannies for democratic liberty. All this, no doubt, can be connected with the method of Marxism. But is it Marxism?

(2) It is logically possible to transcend the limitation of a purely economic interpretation of history and discover that its interests as such, economic, political, military, or other, based on the corresponding functions in the social process, which determine the course of history. This gives us a realistic insight into the character of history and protects us from moralistic or harmonistic illusions. But is it Marxism?

(3) It is logically possible to strip from the belief in final harmony its secular historical interpretation and to restore its suprahistorical religious meaning. Thereby the claim to invariable proletarian harmony and goodness would be given up, and the socialist revolution would become, like other turning points in history, a decisive achievement but neither final nor absolute. Taken in connection with the reinterpretation of the dialectic (1) this would also make it possible to replace the all-proletarian bias by a comprehensive, democratic emphasis on the various groups which are victims of the crisis of capitalism. But is this still Marxism?

Likewise the casual determinism of (a

meanwhile antiquated) scientific logic can be reinterpreted. Since the bourgeois world had claimed to realize man's perfect freedom, the pendulum of Marxian protest swang into the other extreme, that of perfect determinism—we are strictly determined products of a strictly determined economic process. But that this was not really meant can be seen from many passages in Marx, particularly the appeal to the enthusiasm of the revolutionists, which would be absurd if their victory were necessary in the mechanical sense of the word. Marxian philosophy of history is dominated by casual determinism, Marxian social psychology by the appeal to the revolutionary fervor; the two are incongruent. But it is relatively easy to lift them to the higher religious sphere where each finds its proper place and both are reconciled. That we are limited on all sides by overpowering historical forces and events and still left with our freedom and responsibility, with the agony and dignity of our decision as to what to do in every situation, is a fundamental truth. It is a dialectical truth in which freedom and necessity are balanced and interwoven. Thus the "scientific" element in scientific socialism, the claim to make the future calculable, can be overcome.

But such a step has far-reaching consequences. Not only the authority of the founder and the lust of the oppressed for exclusive power, but also the idea of a scientific logic which sees the future as an elongation of present tendencies were responsible for the belief in an all-proletarian end of the capitalist development. The denial of the validity of this method of natural science in historic-political research opens the way to an analysis of the factors which, instead of eliminating the middle classes, gave them new function and new economic and political strength. Here again the purified method overcomes the erroneous results of the unpurified method. But is this still Marxism?

The affirmative answer to this repeated question rests on the preference for the method rather than the results. To Paul Tillich the purified and formalized method of Marxism is "an eternal principle of human existence" like prophecy, Platonism, Protestantism. What matters is the method of prophetic criticism, of dialectical analysis, of sociological economics," "not the special results of Marx and even less the distorted forms of dogmatic Marxism." The affirmative position is further supported by the consideration that to give up the Marxian method would mean the "return to absolution, idealism, voluntarism"—not only anti-Marxian but also anti-prophetic, anti-Christian ideas.

To anticipate the latter point, Marxism is not the only, although historically the most powerful, form of socialism. In British Labor, for instance, only a small intellectual wing has ever been Marxian, while the real leaders, from Keir Hardie down, were evangelists, who did not propagandize socialism as a science, but preached it as a Christian commandment. It is not even true that Marxism is the only dialectical form of socialism; Proudhon was a Hegelian like Marx. One may argue that Marxism alone counts in history, because of its success in Russia; but one should be careful not to take success as the standard of right. The alternative to Marxism need not at all be capitalism, since the right of the oppressed to rise is not a principle which had to wait for Marx to validate it.

But there can be no question of giving up "the method of prophetic crit-

m, of dialectical analysis, of sociology economics." The question is whether name of Marxism belongs to this thod as "an eternal principle of hun existence" or whether it belongs to conclusions to which the method led rx and his disciples: the doctrine of clusive proletarian power as a goal of inescapable development determined economic forces. In other words, is rxism, or can it be, the name of a ool in philosophy? Or is it not rather name of a political movement which only indirectly connected with the rnal principle but directly rests on se "special results" which we are ed to reject as limitations and distions? In a doctrine so emphatic ut the "unity of theory and practice" application of the principle cannot given up as a limitation without sacring the essence of the doctrine.

IV.

Marxism, for the reasons discussed der II, has proved to be, for many ars, a principal obstacle to a serious realistic attack on our most pressing ks. Only as we jettisoned the Marxlegacy piecemeal have we come face face with the real problem. The oblem is that of cooperation in both e domestic and the international scene. For the defense and rebuilding of mocracy in a diversified society everying depends on the delimitation, reonciliation, and cooperation of genuely democratic groups. Cooperation needed in all matters of common inrest, such as the regulation of industrial ctuations. Cooperation cannot inude all groups of society but only the oups of a definitely democratic pattern life and aspirations; it cannot include ose who, while not interested in industrial fluctuations, are interested in the condition which produces them. The program of democratic cooperation is the alternative to both capitalistic disintegration and proletarian conformism. It is in this form that the program was stated, against both Hegel and Marx, by Proudhon, a hundred years ago.

The international aspect of our problem is even more striking. Our life and that of many generations to come is determined by the fact that there was one people in the world which dared stand up to Hitler without being directly attacked by him, Britain. All the others, great and small, waited for Hitler or the Japanese to attack them. In Britain the rising wrath of the people forced war on a reluctant government composed of businessmen and appeasers, and also dragged unfortunate France into the war and finally secured an adequate government for total war on the total enemy. For the uniqueness of this stand there is no Marxian explanation, except by way of the familiar debunking, by saying what has been said innumerable times until the day after Hitler's invasion of Russia, that Britain's war was a "criminal" "war aggression" of "British imperialism" (according to the most official Soviet declaration). No realistic observer believes that perfect purity of purpose could ever prevail in human matters, much less that it could be preserved over a period of years. Our thesis, hence, does not preclude that, once there was war, all vested interests reoriented themselves to take advantage of it, with all the well-known dangers to singleness of purpose in the war. But this, again, does not preclude that there has been the heroic upswing of a people to fight the evil and has made world history.

At the same time the Soviet concluded

its pact with Hitler, those British businessmen and appeasers (not the people who insisted on war) drove the Soviet into the pact. However, we are not here interested in the motives behind the pact. What interests us is the fact that from the point of view of the interpretation of history in terms of economic organization the pact was simply logical. It is incontrovertible that, in terms of economic organization, Nazism is a half-way station between Anglo-Saxon capitalism and Soviet communism. To the progressive character of its economic organization Hitlerism owes much of its formidable appeal. For moral reasons many Marxists felt ill at ease with the pact, but their theory of history was certainly justified by it, or the pact by that theory.

Then Hitler threw Marxism in the camp of Britain, and the war is now fought by a coalition of Russia, China, and the Anglo-Saxon countries. There are many people on both sides of the coalition who feel ill at ease now. We do not say that the search for a common denominator is easy. What we do say is that, in terms of the economic interpretation of history, the fundamental conflict in this age, instead of being what it is, should be between the Anglo-Saxon countries and Russia, with Hitler joining either one or the other of the antagonists. What we do say is that Marxism has as little explanation for the new coalition as has capitalism.

The Marxian idea of a preliminary alliance between socialism and capitalism (in the Communist Manifesto) has no bearing on our problem. This alliance was directed against feudalism, the economic system preceding capitalism and, therefore, in terms of dialectical progress, an obstacle to both capitalism and socialism, while Hitlerism, again, uses all the economic achievements of capitalism to advance beyond it in the direction of the economic organization of socialism. So it is in the extra-economic sphere that the common denominator for our coalition must be sought; the independent reality of this sphere is, however, scornfully denied by Marxism.

Hence Marxians, rescued by Hitler's attack on the Soviet from the moral confusion of their pact with him, are thrown, at the same time, into utter confusion theoretically. They are forced to make this decisive hour of history, a policy for which there is no guidance in the Marxian doctrine. Is this the moment for Socialist Christians to proclaim themselves Marxists?

Watch thou, dear Lord, with those who wake, or watch, or weep, tonight, and give thine angels charge over those who sleep. Tend thy sick ones, O Lord Christ. Rest thy weary ones. Bless thy dying ones. Soothe thy suffering ones. Pity thine afflicted ones. Shield thy joyous ones. And all for thy love's sake. Amen.

St. Augustine.

BY A CHINESE CHRISTIAN

Lord, revive thy church beginning with me. Amen.

ODE TO FREEDOM

I.

Americans, O countrymen! The days
To champion native cause arises again—
O crush the cursed laws, inhuman ways,
Of Lawless realm, O free earth's weeping men!

The saviors who enslave, the wooden lust
As love, the judges scorning what is just;
The sages who despise the truth, the right
As what The Leader says, the glory might;
The thieves in honor robed, the cowards kings—
O countrymen, destroy these vicious things!

II.

What wondrous gift our dust's infinity
Which Life breathed into life!—creating man
With what he may become, enabling free
Or unfree, grace or death to sketch the plan!

Behold! in freedom's fate lies man's—thus may
His night be lit to everlasting day;
In freedom's course salvation multiplies
For all—the one true end of man's emprise;
By freedom's hand hopes dreamed by wretches caught,
Perforce, in life will, *will* we say, be wrought!

III.

We who would live by freedom's sovereign worth
Must know to die to keep our faith alive;
Must understand our place upon this earth:
For what to hope, what dare, what pray, what strive!

Man dying to be free is life in death,
And death in life is man who draws his breath
In tyranny! For what is life if not
Where freedom is; or freedom's cause? And what
Is death if not Idolatry Supreme
In which to speak the truth is to blaspheme?

IV.

Then, ware! As long as freedom helps the weeds
And not the roots of life—denying God
As Source from whence all freedom flows—the seeds
Of vengeful fruit swell there in festered pod.

For freedom's joy is following in God's path:
There, where He governs not, abides His wrath.
Earth's freedom, filling every dream and prayer,
Will surely fail without God's presence there.
O, if this truth be right for us to know,
Subverting it must bring thick clouds of woe!

V.

Thus freedom's foe is still the pharisee,
Whose pride is self, Impenitence Profound;
Whose wisdom, humbled not, cannot be free;
Who, binding first himself, makes freedom bound.

The wisdom ordered not to contrite heart,
A greater wise, becomes a barren part:
A self-consuming arrogant expanse,
Concealing subtler kind of ignorance.
The vain, appeasing ego's boundless range,
Deliver freedom's blood in foul exchange.

VI.

As lads must have the sun for growth and weal,
So mankind needs a Vision to be free—
O fools who laught at Canaan as unreal,
Who hurl their birthrights off into the sea!

Then, humbly, here and now, let us unite
To swear with iron souls enkindled white
That freedom, under God, shall live for all
The world, according with the best we call
America—that here and now this creed
Will toll, and charge the universe to heed!

R. A. Landor.

Defense Is Not Enough

Clifford L. Stanley

Fashions come and go in military matters as in other realms. In *The Nature of Modern Warfare,* for example, Cyril Falls points out that total war is not new. It marked the terrible Thirty Years War. Later, in reaction to it, the end of warfare was set up in which professional groups contested and elaborate rules were evolved to hedge their procedure. The gradual decline of this type of warfare is suggested in a remark attributed to the Spanish ambassador. He is reported to have said to an American official, "Your country and mine have the honor of having fought the last gentlemen's war in history."

Today the military fashion is the offensive. It has not always been so. Some years ago defensive war was stoutly advocated by a school whose best known exponent is Captain Liddell Hart. He had some good arguments on his side. In the French army in the years before the World War there grew up a fierce controversy over how to meet the expected German thrust in the then looming war. One group, headed by General Gallieni, urged a simple defensive procedure. Another group, which took the somewhat simple-minded Joffre for its figurehead, urged attack. The defensive group lost and Gallieni was retired from the general staff. He was made military governor of the Paris district. When the war came the attack strategy prevailed. The French army rushed for where the Germans were supposed to be, leaving France wide open. It is a legend how the discredited Gallieni commandered the taxicabs of Paris and saved the capital in the eleventh hour. By and large it is probably true that the World War was won by a defensive strategy. Given the blockade, the main military procedure of the Allies was to hold their lines against the successive offensive of the Germans. The last and in some ways the most effective of all was in 1918 just before the defeat of Germany. The Allies stood stubbornly and let the Germans beat themselves to pieces.

One reason why it has been so hard for Britain and the United States to give up the defensive is that it won the war last time. It is not easy to abandon a proven strategy. This also is worth noting: Hitler intends to change things; we intend to preserve them. As we say in arguments, the burden of proof is on him. Unless he changes them he loses. It is not enough for him to maintain a defensive position and indeed if he is ever put on the defensive, the blow to his morale will be well nigh fatal. On the other hand, if we by holding on can prevent his proposed changes, we have won. In other words, defense-mindedness is not pure foolishness.

Why then is the offensive so all-important? If the offensive is as important today as many people say it is the reason may be seen in a remark of General Von Reichenau repeated by William L. Shirer in *Berlin Diary.* Von Reichenau said to the correspondents who visited him in June 1940, "You are witnessing one of the few brief moments in history when the offensive is in the ascendent over the defensive." These are not his exact words but they convey his point. The reason is that the airplane plus the armored column enable any line to be

breached, whereas their ability to cut communications make any fixed position untenable. But for every device there is an antidote. The Russians solved successfully many of the German offensive devices; in the Russian counter offensive the Germans devised more forms of modern defense.

The point holds nevertheless that the offensive is in the ascendent. For this reason a simple defensive strategy is the road to defeat. The defensive still has its triumphs as at Tobruk and Bataan but it may not be the way to win the war this time.

Bearing this in mind we can only regard with misgiving the defense-mindedness of our own side in this conflict. The least we can do is to seek its sources and perhaps in some cases seek to remove the cause.

In a military sense the defensive was forced on us in the very nature of the case. The Axis was offensive because it was the challenger. We were defensive because we were the challenged. Furthermore the Axis, though weaker in the ultimate sense, had fully mobilized its industrial and human power. The power arrayed against the Axis is truly fearsome but, except in the case of Russia, it was not ready for immediate use. The only course open to the anti-axis powers was to hold on, to prevent any truly decisive victory until their strength rolled and flew forward in dread actuality. In this period we now find ourselves. Britain is now devoting itself to war production as much as it is able to, given its present social arrangements. The United States is engaged in the process of converting its industry to war production; while there are disappointments as well as happy surprises my information bids me believe the latter to be the more striking.

The defensive means what it says, sheer holding on and holding on, let us recall, when the offensive is the more powerful. The ill-fated resistance in Greece and Jugoslavia form a case in point. It delayed the Axis southward move until past the season for practicable warfare in North Africa and the Near East. This made the attack on Russia practically inevitable, thus bringing that giant ally into the fray. The resistance of Russia itself is a glittering example of the power of the defensive. The Russians set a price for every objective and proceeded to exact it. Even before the counter offensive set in they had destroyed much of the offensive power of Germany and its enabling legend. They probably proved, also before the offensive set in, that a frontal attack by Germany effecting the destruction of the Russian army, is impossible in this war. If so they have by this defensive activity deflected the whole direaction of the war. The strategy of the United Nations in the Far East has been a defensive one though, except in the case of Bataan, not a very glorious display. Nevertheless it did win time for the defense of Australia and India.

There is another defensive strategy to be borne in mind. It may be called the offensive defensive. The first example of this is to be found in the Libyan campaign of General Wavell. Though the war is still in a defensive phase a local offensive was there initiated. This offensive destroyed finally the military power and prestige of Italy. It also forced Germany to divert some equipment and men. Another example is the smashing of the Japanese invasion fleet in the Strait of Macassar. This seriously

layed the final onslaught on Java and us provided the only delay in the whole oceeding. A further instance is the nited States naval attack on the Caro- e and Marshall Islands and on Wake d Marcus Islands. These destroyed panese advance bases and sources of formation and in the case of the raid Marcus stirred fears of air attack on e Japanese mainland. The latest case the offensive defensive is in the attacks the Japanese forces threatening ustralia. They have been so effective to precipitate a serious "counting the st" by Japan. The most notable case this type of defensive is the Russian unter offensive. So far this has raised e siege of Leningrad, released Moscow m imminent peril, taken Mozhiak, a eat offensive base, threatened Kharkov, captured from 20 to 25 percent of the t territory, killed more Germans than e Russians lost during the offensive d above all has shaken the German rale.

Meanwhile the offensive period of the r has not begun for the United Na- ns, unless the Russian counter offen- e may lose its local character and throw e Germans generally on the defensive. is is a possibility. The year for which e United Nations have probably plan- d their offensive is 1943. By that ne United States production and train- g were supposed to warrant it. But t may be too late. This is probably itler's "all out" year in an effort arked already by its "all out" char- ter. Most likely if he does not win is year he cannot win. Conjoining is desperate necessity with the relative periority of the offensive gives us use for anxiety. It causes us to raise estions about the date of our offensive and even deeper questions about our mental temper.

It seems to me that the military defensive is not only a matter of preparation, nor even chiefly so. The military defensive is so congenial a strategy because the western nations are passive in this period of history. We are not trying to do something, to change and to build. We are trying to hold on to something, to preserve and to maintain.

The Axis has not only the military advantage of the airplane-tank team but it has the spiritual advantage of a cause. This lends to its drive and, if I may put it so, daemonic power. We do not agree with any of their aims as they hold them yet most of their ends are desirable. They have solved the problem of the machine age, that is, rational survey of industrial equipment, rational allocation of the product and the consequent absorption of unemployment. The by-products in the destruction of human values, the war-like character of the economy, etc., make the solution formal and empty. In like manner they have unified Europe, a thing demanded by the times, but in a way disallowed by the times. They have reacted against the over-individualism of modern western thought and recoiled from the mechanizing of human relations in modern industrial society. They have achieved these ends wrongly but they have given men something to believe in, to live for and to die for gladly.

Fascism is not the real future, the wave of the future. It is an imposter, a *would-be future.* But what then are we? We are the *present.* We have the best that history in our era has produced up to this moment. We have civil liberty and even war time has not dimmed it much. We have political liberty and the

assured tradition of it. We have religious liberty and our idolatry is voluntary. We have liberty of the press and not a propaganda press with its implicit denial of reason. We have all this and much more and they are good. We have also the machine in its most fully developed form—and no solution of its problem. Our economy is not planned. Unemployment reigned until a military economy prevailed, thanks to the Axis. We have the achievements of today and the unmet challenge of tomorrow. We are ambiguous, an achievement and a problem.

The Axis too is ambiguous. It is a solution which raises more problems than it solves. At any rate it is a revolution with fire, hope and momentum and I believe that the "medicine" in this is superior to that in those who are satisfied. Given the military advantage of the offensive the point seems conclusive. A satisfied man, even a threatened satisfied man, simply cannot generate the superhuman energies to deal with a superhuman revolutionary. The satisfied man asks how much he must expend to keep what he has; the revolutionary never descends to the demand level at all. Someone may interpose the fact of the apathy of the German people about the war. In answer to this, Hitler and the Nazis believe in their revolution. Furthermore a totalitarian country is less dependent on the temper of the people than a democratic country. The fact remains that the revolutionary temper is more dynamic than the satisfied temper. If it is objected that the Nazi spirit too is ambiguous, the most that can be derived from the argument is a stalemate, certainly no victory for us.

Not only does our present temper cause us to fall short of the fascists; it also causes us to fall short of our own best selves, in two ways. First, and most importantly, we have no great hope. By definition we have our heaven already. We may be satisfied with it in a sluggish sort of way and that may be all right for ordinary times. But these are extraordinary times when we need the maximum employment of our powers. We must live greatly in these times to live at all. There is one great hope, full of power, to set before us. Let us seriously propose to solve the problem of the machine age with all the physical and cultural betterment attendant thereon. The second reason we are not our best selves in this period of spiritual defensiveness is that our conscience is not clear. We use high sounding words about "the cause of righteousness" and "light against dark." But we know that we are no simple case of light and righteousness. Our citizens have been unfed. Multitudes have known none of the benefits of socially valuable work. The unsolved problem of a technical age corrupts our political life. In a dim way we know that we are at least partly to blame for the excesses of the Axis. We simply cannot become fanatical about the defense of a way of life whose shortcomings we know all too well. We are expected to have the exaltation of saints yet our leaders deny us the repentance indispensable from sanctity. It will not work. We are not our best selves.

Perhaps when it becomes a matter of survival we will cast off our defensiveness where the order of society is concerned and open our hearts to a new world. In that case even the vast sorrow of the war might bring forth some fruit. If it did the religious man would understand, as he has all along, that "without shedding of blood there is no remission of sin."

he Religious Foundations f Populism

by Marvin Halverson

The Populist movement was the last at struggle between industrial capital- and the agrarians. When the last ot of the Civil War was fired, the dom- nce of industrialism in American life s assured. The agrarians, who had n victory under Andrew Jackson, now re confronted with the fact of their bservience to industrialism. It was ap- rent in Southern agriculture, which s mortally dislocated by the ravages of r and the break-up of established econ- ic relationships. It was not so ap- rent in the West where the vast reaches land had just been opened up for tlement by the Homestead Act. But hin thirty years the land had been tled and farmers had discovered that ir hopes had turned to ashes.

In the orgy of dividing the spoil of gin lands after the Civil War, which rrington had aptly termed "The Great rbecue," the farmers discovered that oritism had been shown in the appor- nment. The farmers' pickings were ager when compared with the pickings speculators in the railroad grants. The a of a beneficent government, of ich they were a part, giving of its gen- us store to its citizens was not contrary their conception of democracy. But farmers and common folk expected t fair play and equality of opportunity uld be part of the procedure. There s sufficient revelation of the graft and rruption in government grants to the sted interests to demonstrate to the nerican common folk that they had ceived the worst end of the deal.

Although the settling of the great West had been surrounded with the picturesque and the romantic, the farmer did not experience such a favorable lot. In the new agriculture of the West, the farmer produced not just for himself but for a national and a world market. The change in his status, his participation in a national and an international economy rather than a private economy, made him subject to the relentless rule of prices, dealers' commissions, warehouse charges and freight rates. During the period from 1870 to 1897 farm prices declined almost steadily. Freight rates increased despite the low farm prices and many times a farmer got no more for his products than the freight, commission, and stockyard or elevator charges.

The pioneers had gladly accepted the sacrifices of frontier life in the expectation that within a few years they would have achieved security. Their hopes were thwarted, for they found with the passing years that they were increasingly subservient to the "interests," virtually helpless in the grip of economic forces. Hamlin Garland, returning to the "Middle Border" from Boston where he had been teaching and writing, was depressed to discover the drudgery of existence among his people. He learned that one old friend "occasionally doubted whether the life they were living was worth while. 'We make the best of it,' she said, 'but none of us is living up to our dreams'." In visiting another friend, Garland noted that "the days of the border were over, and yet Arvilla, his wife, was ill and

aging, still living in pioneer discomfort toiling like a slave."

Above this toil, bleakness, and gloom, the farmers projected their hopes for a better day, rallying into the Grange, then the Farmers' Alliance and the People's Party. Into these groups with increasing fervor was gathered all the pent-up feeling of injustice and the desire for economic security. "These Greenbackers and Populists were recognized as the 'Adullamites' of American politics around whom, as around King David at the cave of Adullam 'everyone that was in distress and everyone that was discontented gathered themselves.' "

The Populist movement included not only the People's Party but the Farmers' Alliance as well. The Alliances started around 1880 and by 1890 the movement had elected 52 congressmen. The populists included many city workers as well as farmers although it was primarily a rural movement. But it is very significant that the Alliances were insistent that both workers and farmers had a common cause. Organized labor did not respond with like enthusiasm.

The political struggle waged by the Populists in 1892 and 1894 climaxed in the dramatic campaign in behalf of Bryan in 1896. The defeat of Bryan meant the end of Populism as a political force but its spirit lived on into subsequent reform movements, left wing and farm organizations. The agrarian revolt of the 1890s' ended in failure and a triumphant imperialistic industrialism strode into the 20th century.

The Populist movement commenced with specific demands for economic and political reforms before it developed a political and social philosophy. From its inception, however, certain principles were implicit in its argument. For instance, its presuppositions were those of Jacksonian democracy. Not only the Jacksonian heritage exerted influence upon the Populists, but the frontier itself for most of them took part in the great settling. By developing qualities and values which the ascendent capitalism crushed in individual lives, the frontier contributed immensely to the agrarian revolt.

The Populist movement was not solely dependent upon the frontier as the source of its ideological concepts. Of great interest and significance is the religious character of the Populist crusade, constituting a unique aspect of this last great struggle between industrial capitalism and the agrarians. Populism has been aptly characterized as "a religious revival, a crusade, a pentecost of politics in which each spake as the spirit gave him utterance." The spokesmen of Populism depended heavily on their own religious faith and used Scriptural teachings to buttress their conclusions regarding economic and political reforms. The appeal to Scripture as authority for the aims of the movement was popular because in that way any man could turn to the Bible and discover what was right and what was wrong. The program of the Populists thereby derived divine sanction and moral urgency. "The People's Party thus became a tabernacle under which gathered all those bent on the defense of the divine laws of justice against those who put world affairs first."

A very interesting instance of this reference to Scripture was contained in *The Southern Mercury,* one of the leading Southern Populist papers. In the movement there was considerable argument over the question of incorporating a number of "side-issues" into the Populist program, such as woman suffrage and

hibition, thereby broadening the base he movement. This realistic political tegy was justified by reference to the ocalyptic city described in Revelation 12,13 as having twelve gates, three each side, indicating that "the citizens reof entered in through very different ons."

The same paper reported at another e that a People's Party statistician had npiled the number of times usury was bidden in the Bible and discovered t usury was forbidden 163 times, more n any other sin or crime. The paper ed attention to the fact that the Demo- s continued to justify what the Lord l clearly condemned.

The Dallas Morning News reported t one preacher delivered a series of e Populist sermons, tracing the de- nds of their program, including the -treasury scheme, directly back to the pture.

Even more significant than the use of ipture as proof-text for a political pro- m was the apocalyptic element in the pulist movement. To comprehend basis of this apocalypticism one must all the plight of the farmer. He wit- sed a progressive diminution of his es by which he had lived as the forces nature operated against him and as he k deeper into debt and despair. Ham- Garland described the gloom that set- over the "Middle Border" as the s for help went unanswered in the ncial and political capitals of Amer-

The task of the farmer in securing re- ss of his grievances was made mani- d in that he had few spokesmen in ces of authority. The prestige of the ming class had declined as the indus- list-capitalist forces strode into ascen- ncy after the Civil War. The exist-ence for the ambitious, or brighter prospects in the city than on the farm, drew the more dynamic young men into the centers of finance and industry. Furthermore, many of the farmers of the West were recent immigrants from Europe who were not immediately accessible as sources of significant leadership. Thus the agrarians were robbed of many potential leaders.

Yet it was out of this somber setting that the farmers arose to assert that men "come upon the earth not by any laws of government but by nature's laws, the laws of God, and have a perfect right to the use of the earth, free and unencumbered."

These farmers projected anew the dreams and hopes of the pioneers which had been still-born in their experience. This time they believed their dreams would be realized when the "cause" would triumph and true democracy would be realized in the nation. To these sturdy and humble folk a profound conviction that their demands were in the name of divine justice gave them enormous moral dynamic in their crusade. James B. Weaver, the Populist presidential candidate in 1892, put that conviction in these words:

> "When Barak, after he and his people had suffered twenty years of oppression, overthrew Jabin and the captain of his Host, Deborah declared that the battle was from heaven; that 'the stars in their courses fought against Sisera.' And may we not reverently believe that the struggle of the oppressed people of our day to reinvest themselves of their lands, their money, and their highways, is from heaven also?"

There are many who would agree with one Populist who said that "surely it can-

not always be said that the voice of the people is the voice of God; but the people while sometimes in error, are oftener right than their critics." But it is more than likely that the actual feeling of the Populists was expressed by Annie L. Diggs, one of the leading Populist women from Kansas, who wrote in *The Arena*:

> "The whole earth is instinct with the coming change. The very trees of the forest are alive with gladness. The waters of the sea are sounding delight that the time is so near for creating conditions which will make humanity receptive to the influx of the oncoming flood of spiritual truth."

In the same article she tells of the famous St. Louis meeting when the Farmers' Alliance, the Knights of Labor and other labor groups formed a united front. She said:

> "The men of the farms and the men of the mills and mines joined forces. The movement gained momentum. Nothing can stand before it, because the time is come. The purpose for which was all this preparation must be attained."

The whole movement was poised for the moment "the time is come" when God's will would be imposed on society through the agents of God's will, the people. Nowhere in American history have there been leaders of political movements of any importance who have spoken so much like Old Testament prophets. Certainly none of them spoke with greater vigor and insight than J. H. Powers, president of the National Alliance. At the Omaha convention of the Alliance held in 1892, just before the launching of the People's Party, Powers exhorted the delegates, saying:

> "Be not deceived. This people must be redeemed. If we prove unworthy of the trust we have undertaken, God will raise up other instruments to accomplish His will, for He has purposed great things for this nation and will accomplish them. But we, how shall we answer for our lost opportunities? What will our children think of us? How shall we answer on that day when nations and societies are yet on trial as well as individuals?"

The belief that God and history were operating in their behalf was expressed repeatedly in Populist speeches, books, magazines, and newspapers. Old party politicians were brought to the realization that here was a new type of adversary. They were ordinary, hard-working men and women but they were filled with a zeal and devotion not found in the other parties. One newspaper in reporting a Populist convention said "their earnestness, bordering on religious fanaticism, has a touch of the kind of metal that made Cromwall's roundheads so terrible a force in the revolution that ended with bringing the head of Charles I to the block. It would be folly to despise and belittle a movement that is leavened with such moral stuff as this."

Under the stimulus of this belief that they were the instruments of God in ushering in an age of justice and brotherhood, the Populists achieved a power which was out of proportion to their economic strength. In the Bryan campaign of 1896, the nation witnessed the power of a movement which believes that it is working out God's will, for the Bryan crusade obtained from the Populists this dynamic strength which struck terror into the hearts of the elite.

Although the Populist did not share the bitterness of many radical move-

s, their denunciation of evils in so- was not dulled. Typical of their ous ethical evaluation of society is excerpt from a very popular book at day, *The Coming Climax*:

"An all pervading national selfish- ss is our national crime, and this of- nse on the part of an enlightened d Christianized people, who know e better way but go not in it, is the me of crimes before God. Let us member that all the world's past has en made dark and tragic by a greed at comes out of the animal nature man . . . . All the injustice and elty of earth have rootage therein d draw hideous life and malignant ength therefrom."

peatedly, the Populists urged a re- o spiritual value as a means of over- ng the selfish motives of men. More a score of utopian novels appeared pport of the Populist program and them moralized on the corrupting nce of money and the need of liv- ccording to spiritual rather than rial values.

ne of the most popular novels of the d was *Caesar's Column* by Ignatius nelly, the Minnesota Populist leader. riting this work, which was a fantas- ece of utopian fiction, Donnelly said ught to

reach into the ears of the able and h and powerful the great truth that glect of the suffering of their fel- vs, indifference to the great bond of otherhood which lies at the base of ristianity, and blind, brutal and de- ading worship of mere wealth, must given time enough—eventuate in e overthrow of society and the de- uction of civilization."

ne of their papers published in Chicago bore the name *The Vanguard—Marching Toward A Diviner Civilization.* That is what hundreds of thousands of Populists thought they were doing.

A disquieting aspect of the Populist movement was the streak of anti-semitism which ran through it and was quite apparent in the literature of Western reform. Jews figured as villains in several Populist novels. Ignatius Donnelly in *Caesar's Column* made the chief plutocratic tyrant a Jew, and his state of mind on the question of the Jews is obvious as he writes:

> "His father, who grew exceedingly rich and ambitious, purchased a princedom in Italy for a large sum, and the government being hard up for money, conferred the title of Prince with the estate. . . . Yes . . . the aristocracy of the world is now almost altogether of Hebrew origin. . . They are the great money getters of the world. They rose from dealers in old clothes and peddlers of hats to merchants, to bankers. . . "

As if to clinch his argument against the Jews, Donnelly makes the leader of the conspiratorial Brotherhood of Destruction a Jew as well. In the end, this radical Jew, who has helped to bring on the revolution, turns traitor and absconds with millions from the public treasury.

The Populist controlled Vanguard Press of Indianapolis published one of the most violent anti-semitic documents in the 1890s' *The Tocsin of Alarm.* A quotation from this denunciation of upper class churches and Jews will prove illustrative:

> "For sixteen centuries the Jew waged a losing fight with the Christian Church for his favorite practice of usury. Today all is changed—his vic-

tory, his ascendancy is complete. He made the Issue squarely with the Nazarene, and as it stands today he is absolutely victorious. Yes, gentlemen of the plutocratic clergy and church press, you need not wince; now it is Jewdom and debt. The intelligent 'common people' of whom it is written, 'they heard Jesus gladly," plainly behold you, playing into the hands of your Jew usury masters; you deceive no one any longer but yourselves. 'He that is not for us is against us.' Where are you? Among the 'devourers of widow's houses,' 'the whited sepulcher full of dead men's bones?' We do not say where you are; but we beg leave to inform you, you will very soon be compelled to get on one side or the other of this struggle between 'the common people' and the English-American-Jew aristocrat and plutocrat.

"And in the end the Jew and his plutocratic allies are going to the wall, in this struggle as sure as the Nazarene ever strode the earth, looked into the faces of men and inspired them with the gospel of temporal, as well as eternal salvation."

It is not so strange that farmers, caught in the clutch of indebtedness, generalized from their personal experience and ascribed all their woes to the financial institutions. Many of the Populists believed that "the bankers of the world and their lackeys" were involved in an international conspiracy. The international fame of the Rothschild family in the 19th century aided them in identifying the Jewish race with finance.

The Populist movement arose out of the conflict between a lusty and dynamic capitalism and the less powerful agrarian economy. As such it was primarily a crusade for economic and political reforms which would bring security to the farmer. But in Populism can be seen the tendency for man's economic self-interest and idealism to merge, lifting the struggle for existence to a point where it has moral authority behind it. However, it was not only a matter of appropriating the symbols and authority of religion to their cause. The struggle tended to develop its own ethic, and certainly to condition their interpretation of moral and ethical judgment.

Although they did not attain their goal of political victory and vanished from the scene by 1900, the Populist spirit has inspired farmers' struggles to the present day. All the tendencies in the Populist movement which have been mentioned are latent in the middle-western areas of the United States today. They did not disappear with the passing of the Populist movement, but lie imbedded in much of rural America. Anyone who is concerned with the problems and potentialities of farmers today must be cognizant of that fact.

A PRAYER

Grant O Lord that amid the tumult and sorrows of the war which engulfs the nations, in which thou dost caste the mighty from their seats and makest the judges of the earth as vanity, thy people may hear Thy voice.

ook Reviews

E EIGHTEENTH CENTURY BACKGROUND: STUDIES ON THE IDEA OF NATURE IN THE THOUGHT OF THE PERIOD. *by Basil Willey,* New York. Columbia University Press. 302 pp. Index $3.25.

The word "background" in the title his book has a double meaning. The in the usual one: The climate of nion prevailing at the time. But Mr. ley is not content merely to delineate in a discursive manner, which he s, to be sure, entertainingly and with ear and succinct literary style. Also pushes these various political and osophical opinions back into a theo- cal context: he shows what they imply xpressions of ultimate meaning. Ber- d Russell once said that all metaphy- is covert theology. Mr. Willey lements this dictum in a most illum- ng way. The word "background" s on a genuine religious meaning. As sult he reveals the many contradi- s which reside in the fundamental as- ption of eighteenth centruy thought he uncriticized and unacknowledged mption which being fundamentally radictory in terms of essential mean- finally produce actual conflicts and vages on the existential level of his- .

Mr. Willey is not content to deal with sm in terms of Newtonian physics celestial mechanics—to determine validity of Deism in terms of the ntific pre-suppositions of the time. wants to see what Deism *meant,* as *Veltanschauung,* as an implicit theo- . He does this by looking at it as a practical religion and then showing what its real assumptions were. He notes that the Newtonian world-view first expressed itself in an "optimism of acceptance." But he shows that this complacent doctrine was socially conditioned as well as grounded in contemporary physics. He declares: "The centuries following the Renaissance liberated the acquisitive impulses, also in the name of Nature, and severed economic ethics from control by any comprehensive conception of the ultimate purpose of human (not to say Christian) living." Significantly the early optimism, the "optimism of acceptance," gave way to the "optimism of progress." Pope's slogan "whatever is, is right" surrendered to "whatever will be, will be right." Both are optimistic and perhaps Newtonian physics had something to do with that; but there is nothing in the scientific doctrine itself to promote the shift from acceptance to progress. And, as Mr. Willey shows, the optimism *per se* was tainted. Of the earlier view, he writes: "Optimism at this level is admittedly almost impossibly hard to attain, and can never be long sustained by flesh and blood." So an "optimism of progress" *had* to replace an "optimism of acceptance" by reason of the dialectical necessity inherent in the logic of optimism itself, regardless of the utter deficiency of scientific, metaphysical or theological warrant. This was so much whistling in the dark; but the age wanted to be optimistic and it was determined to be so: Nature is Good, it is Reasonable to be Optimistic.

Summing up the period, Mr. Willey says, "Speaking broadly, we are con-

fronted, on approaching the eighteenth century, with a steady decline in what has been called the tragic sense of life. We have gone on too long, it was felt, repeating that we are miserable offenders, and that there is no health in us. We must change these notes to something more cheerful, something more befitting a polite and civilized age." True, the discovery of the Great Machine—Newton's universe—had much to do with this feeling. But there was also one quite independent source: the urge to be rid of the dark Christian view. "The supernatural,in both its divine and diabolical forms, was banished from Nature," Mr. Willey points out, adding significantly: "But, if one may put it so, Satan was banished on harsher terms than his divine Antagonist."

Mr. Willey's study covers all the principle figures of the century and many minor ones. He deals at some length with Shaftesbury, Butler, Hume, Hartley, Holbach, Priestley, Godwin and Wordsworth. He gives a few incisive pages to Dr. Johnson and Edmund Burke, for whom he has an especial liking, pointing out that as Leslie Stephen said long ago, "in a superficial age the pessimistic characters are likely to be the most attractive." He deals with the Romantic revolt: from Nature as Reason to Nature as Feeling. He shows the reasonable (if not rational) ground for this by comparing Bentham's point of view summed up in the question, "Is it true?" with Coleridge's, "What is the meaning of it?"—the latter being of course, the question behind Mr. Willey's own method. He shows that Wordsworth's revolt against Godwin's rationalism was rationally sound, because as Wordsworth points out in the introduction to *The Borderers,* "The attempt to live by the naked reason [Godwin's phrase], though it may be a noble aspiration, is apt to produce monsters rather than supermen."

A few lines from the second act of *The Borderers*—which are not quoted by Mr. Willey—will show the profundity of Wordsworth, not only when compared with the superficiality of the eighteenth century, but also as something to turn to in our own time:

> We look
> But at the surface of things: we hear
> Of towns in flames, fields ravished, young and old
> Driven out in troops to want and nakedness;
> Then grasp our sword and rush upon a cure
> That flatters us, because it asks not thought;
> The deeper malady is better hid;
> The world is poisoned at the heart.

Richard W. Day.

THE MAKING OF TOMORROW, *by Raoul de Roussy de Sales,* New York. Reynal & Hitchcock. 338pp. $3.00.

This book, by a "Free French" journalist of half American extraction and training, gives as good an account of the Average American mentality and its inherent dangers as one can find anywhere. American nationalism and patriotism, according to the author, are almost synonymous with a special notion of democracy, which combines materialism, optimism, a tradition of gradualism, the love of freedom, a belief in the divine inspiration of "the people" and of the coincidence of increasing happiness, wealth, and goodness into a curious mixture. The author hopes that American democracy will become more militant and

e virile, as British democracy has al-
y done; but he is candid in his ad-
ion that so far, neither the endeavors
President Roosevelt, nor the shock of
rl Harbor have proved sufficient to
ken the people to a realization of
danger in which they are.

The best part of the book is the analy-
of the ruling class interest as leaning
ard Hitler in the attempt to escape
growing menace of collectivism.
erism, of course, is a form of col-
vism but makes use of any organized
rest that is ready to serve it. The
or shows how for a German busi-
man to bow to Hitler was no abdica-
at all because he had never held, or
red to, supreme power independent
he authority of the state. The les-
of France teaches that a few big in-
rialists would benefit by collabora-
and the example of our "Fight
sevelt First" people shows a similar
ency. The important difference, ac-
ing to the author, is that the Roose-
administration, like Churchill's Eng-
, appears bent on enlisting the full
port of the people for the war, while
adier lost the war, and Chamberlin
his, because their deference to the
industrialists made the people apa-
ic.

Equally interesting but by no means
lly incontrovertible is the main
nosis which the author gives of our
s. It is that German nationalism is
rent from any other nationalism, in
it is an ever recurrent revolt against
ization, in the name of romanticism,
German mystery which foreigners
not fathom. He does not quite re-
luce Vansittart's thesis. He thinks
er that there is a periodic swing of
man civilization into and out of the
t of civilization. Since he is not cer-
tain that if a German defeat brought German liberals to power, such a change would be a guarantee against another revolt, he obviously measures the German problem in terms which make it quite insoluble.

The other aspects of his analysis do not add anything important to an understanding of the present situation. The nationalistic, collectivistic and pacifistic tendencies, which cut across the present struggle, are described in chapters which are sometimes brilliant but remain nevertheless vague and inconclusive. He has a very profound understanding of the weaknesses of the democracies but evidently has no hope that the chastisements and experiences of war might possibly eliminate some of these weaknesses. Hence he has little hope for the future. Russia is a practically negligible force for the future in his opinion. His racial theory limits both the breadth and the depth of his understanding of our tragic era.

Eduard Heimann.

RELIGION AND POLITICS, *by F. W. Sollmann.* Pendle Hill Pamphlet No. 14. 63 pp. Pendle Hill, Wallingford, Pa. $.15.

The author of this pamphlet is a former socialist leader and minister of the Interior (in the Stresemann Cabinet) of the German Republic, who went through persecution and torture at the hands of the Nazis before he could escape to freedom. His is the unique case of a prominent man somewhat advanced in years, who felt that it was not for him to preach to others after the frustration of his and his party's efforts. He settled down to think and study with

the Quakers, and emerged after some years as a speaker impressive through experience, fairness, and thoughtfulness.

The significance of this booklet is in the fact that it is the first booklet for the lay public in a field more vital than any other. This is not to say that it exhausts its problem—it is far too modest to pretend to such a claim. Nor is it addressed to all lay readers alike. Its special purpose is to convince religious people that their religion is not profound enough if it does not manifest itself in practical solutions of the unsolved political problems. It is directed against the mysticism, of Quakers and others, which believes that the world can be rebuilt by spreading the spirit of Brotherhood and by humanitarian rescue work. His point is that religious people must not escape into such work and leave the issues of public life to un-Christian and anti-Christian forces. They should rather take upon themselves the full weight of political responsibility with its inevitable share of frustration and compromise. He understands that our struggle, as any historic struggle, is not one between pure justice and pure injustice; but he does not find this a sufficient reason for not taking sides. Coming as it does from a widely experienced man the pamphlet abounds in pertinent observations on the slow growth of democracy, the roots of Hitlerism, the unfortunate inclination of Christians to blame everything on Versailles, etc. He presents a "program for Christian democracy," which he finds "as easy to formulate as it is difficult to put into practice." The most important aspect of this program is a "new concept of the moral character of statecraft." Within its well defined limits the booklet is exemplary in its spirit and its popular presentation.

When will someone attempt the corollary task of convincing the politically minded that they cannot succeed in their political task without finding and using the religious resources of wisdom and strength?

Eduard Heimann.

THE CHRISTIAN INTERPRETATION OF SEX, *by Otto Piper.* Charles Scribners. $2.00.

This is a very significant book upon sex. It is written by a theologian who understands all the contributions which modern psychology has made to the sex problem but who is also more interested in the Biblical attitude toward sex than most modern Christian students of sex have been. His primary purpose is to relate the total attitude of the Bible toward man's physical existence, its insistance on the sacramental character of life and its understanding of the unity of body and soul, to problems of sex. Such an understanding, he is convinced, would make Christian teaching on sex more imaginative and generous in its treatment of the physical basis of a happy marriage, less concerned to justify sexual relations in marriage for the purposes of procreation only, and more appreciative of the true meaning of the words that the "two shall be one flesh."

Dr. Piper rightly believes that the Catholic sex ethic, with its dogmatic preference of virginity over matrimony and its judgment upon the "carnal pleasures" of married life, is less than full Christian. Though himself a Reformation theologian, he also understands that the Reformation in both Calvin and Luther, though rejecting the Catholic dualism, was not able to achieve a really positive

mpletely wholesome attitude toward iage.

e admits that these defects in the dox Christian view are partly de- from some of St. Paul's teachings, ularly from the Pauline dictum that etter to marry than to burn. It may uestioned whether he admits this rously enough or is fully conscious he contributions which modern ght has made to the sex problem. e are aberrations in modern thought n can best be corrected by a total tian view of human nature. But while it is wholesome for Christians mit that heresy has and can free doxy of unchristian Christian ings which some stray authoritative of an apostle has introduced into Christian stream of thought and tradition has perpetuated.

annot be maintained that St. Paul's standing of the sex problem was ularly profound. In dealing with was modest enough to introduce eservation "This say I and not the " a reservation which Christian tra- has usually disregarded. Pauline rity has had some unfortunate con- nces in the field of sex in both lic and Protestant thought; and it ot until Christian thought was chal- d by unchristian thought, of the ype, that these weaknesses in the tian attitude toward sex could be ated. We ought to admit more ously that Christian thought re- d correction at this point. But Dr. 's thesis that the most wholesome hic is in accord with a total Biblical f man, of the unity of his physical piritual life and of the sacramental ter of his covenants, is a very le one.

R. N.

THE SICKNESS UNTO DEATH, *by Soren Kierkegaard.* Translated by Walter Lowrie. Princeton University Press. $2.75.

Repetition, and Fear and Trembling by the same author, translator and publisher.

Dr. Lowrie has now brought out three more of Kierkegaard's works. They are hardly sufficiently relevant to the purpose of this journal to deserve review. But they must be mentioned because Dr. Lowrie's sacrificial labors in making Kierkegaard's thought available to English and American readers, deserve our praise and gratitude. Of the three volumes, "Repetition" is most difficult and least important. It is a discussion of the relation of the religious, the ethical and the aesthetic attitude toward life, a problem which is clarified in other volumes. "Sickness Unto Death" is Kierkegaard's study of despair as the precondition of faith and is one of the profoundest of his religious treatises. "Fear and Trembling" is his analysis of religious faith on the basis of the Biblical story of Abraham's sacrifice. He explicates the thesis that "Faith is the paradox that the particular is higher than the universal, yet in such a way—that the individual, having been in the universal, now as the particular isolated himself as higher than the universal." This is to say that every individual transcends the general ethical and philosophical categories of thought. If this is not true, "then one needs no other categories than the Greeks possessed." Only by faith can the individual, who transcends all subordinate systems of coherence and meaning, find meaning in life by finding God. Kierkegaard's religious individualism rises to the point of destroying the meaning of life

in its social context, and his interpretation of faith, sets it too completely in contradiction to the subordinate and mediate expressions of life's meaning. But he does illumine the pinnacle of human existence, even if he disassociates it too much from the general experience of life.

R. N.

AMERICA AND WORLD MASTERY, *by John MacCormac.* Duell Sloan and Pearce. $2.75.

MacCormac is one of those journalists of our time who have distinguished themselves more than many academics in their analysis of modern history. He surveys the whole problem of American foreign relations and in this survey two fields of interest are discussed with special astuteness.

The one is the relation of two impulses in American life, the impulse to domination and imperialism in a powerful nation, and the impulse toward isolation. The latter is partly derived from our continental security and partly from vagaries of our youthfulness. MacCormac's analysis of this problem is superb, particularly his portrayal of the climax which a spiritualized form of imperialism reaches in Woodrow Wilson and the sudden anti-climax of isolationism which followed after the world war.

The other field of interest is the relation between Britain and America. Believing that any kind of world organization will be impossible without close collaboration between Britain and America the author surveys the causes of friction between the two nations in the past and the possible sources of misundersanding in the future. In estimating the virtues and vices of our more bourgeois democracy in comparison with the compound of feudal and bourgeois elements which lie at the foundation of British democracy, the author is both witty and wise and contributes to genuine mutual understanding. *R.N.*

THE DESTINY OF WESTERN MAN, *by W. T. Stace.* Reynald and Hitchcock. $3.00.

This volume represents the prize book of a contest for the best non-fiction book, conducted by the publishers. It is presumably a defense of the higher values of western civilization and seeks to explain why our cause must triumph, not because it is our cause, but because democratic civilization is in conformity with the realities of life.

According to the author, western civilization rests upon the Greek idea of the primacy of reason and the Christian idea of sympathy as the final good. The combination of these two, for some strange reason produces the idea of the "infinite value of the individual." As against this individualism of democracy totalitarianism rests upon the assumption of the primacy of the will, rather than reason and of the nation, rather than the individual, as the end of life.

All this is really quite unbelievably naive. "Sympathy" is the worst possible synonym for the Christian love ethic, since the New Testament "agape" represents a radical concern for the other, rather than the self, quite beyond the category of "sympathy." Furthermore, the Christian religion can hardly be identified with the law of love, since it has a conception of life and history, which deals with the perennial conflict between the sin of self-love and the higher law of love.

Furthermore, the author does not

rstand at all that western civiliza-
s imperiled precisely because it had
mple notions of love, reason and
finite value of the individual. Our
cratic civilization assumed that a
ethic could be made effective in
s without coming to terms with the
f self-love and the consequent an-
of conflicting wills-to-power, which
al society must somehow or other
e into a tolerable harmony. It be-
uncritically in the supremacy of
n without understanding life as will
s vitality. If there were not an
nt of truth in the fascist glorification
ll and vitality, it would not have
so close to triumph in our day.

like manner Nazi collectivism is a
rse answer to an inadequate demo-
individualism. The idea of the "in-
value of the individual" is inci-
y one of the most confused con-
ns of our day. What does it mean?
he individual is immortal? That
nscends all social and historical
and is finally his own end? There
lement of truth in liberal individ-
. It is right in refusing to make
llective organism the final end of
ual life. But is it not wrong in
ing the individual as the final end
social life?

net effect of such a book is to
is more complacent about our civ-
n and to encourage the hope that
racy is bound to triumph over
rianism. The real situation is that
racy has almost succumbed to total-
ism, and may yet succumb because
rs in estimating human nature and
history, have been, though less
se, hardly less mistaken than those
litarianism.

R. N.

MAN'S VISION OF GOD, *by Charles Hartshorne.* Willet Clark and Co. $3.00.

Dr. Hartshorne, who is professor of philosophy at Chicago University, has written one of the most exciting books in natural theology in recent decades. While his colleague Professor Weiman has reduced the philosophy of Whitehead (with an admixture of Dewey) to a flat naturalism, Professor Hartshorne has taken Whitehead as a basis and (with an admixture of traditional Biblical concepts) arrived at a new statement of Christian theism.

His particular problem is to define both the perfection of God and the Christian affirmation about his suffering love and mercy in such a way that they do not stand in contradiction to each other. He maintains that a God who has the kind of perfection ascribed to him by some Christian theologians could not possibly suffer with and for his children. These theories consign God to a kind of equanimity which really excludes every meaningful conception of love. His "perfect power" consists in this, that no matter what the creatures do with their free will they cannot bring about the destruction of the cosmos as such, they cannot reduce God to solitariness. . . God has need of the maximum possible addition (of event-values stored in his memory) not in the sense that he must have it 'or else' but in the sense that it is to his interest to have it."

The perfection of God is defined by Hartshorne, not primarily in terms of those absolutes which have been ascribed to him, from the theology of the schoolmen to our own day, but in terms of his "self-surpassing" character, which is to say that the capacity for self-transcend-

ence, a capacity which can only be described in symbols taken from the conceptions of consciousness, is the essential form of his perfection.

A brief review cannot due justice to the highly polished precision of Hartshorne's mind. It is a mind which has dwelt long and thought deeply upon the ultimate problems of religion and which refuses to accept the paradoxes of faith without making the most careful metaphysical inquiry into their meaning and into the possibility of resolving them by a more adequate analysis.

One sometimes has the impression that Hartshorne is a kind of Thomist, anti-Thomist, who uses philosophy to destroy the too philosophical theism of medieval theology, and who is not fully conscious of the fact that the definition of God, which he makes more precise in philosophical terms is one which has been arrived at "by faith and revelation" and could not have been achieved merely by metaphysical speculations. But on the other hand, his careful thought is of tremendous value in challenging the theologian to reexamine his basic affirmations, to inquire into their meaning, and to eliminate absurd contradictions within the total system of theological thought.

This is the kind of book which ministers should use as a basis for months of careful study. Hartshorne speaks with authority, that is with the authority of a profound and scrupulous mind.

R. N

VIRGIN SPAIN, *by Waldo Frank.*

Duell Sloan and Pearce. $3.00.

This book, originally published in 1926, has been republished with some additional sections which bring it up to date. It is Waldo Frank's most distinguished book and is certainly the most definitive book about Spain in modern times. What makes it valuable for readers of this journal is that it goes far beyond Spain in its analysis of the relation of Catholicism to a national, in this case the Spanish culture. His chapters on Don Quixote are a moving and profound analysis of Catholic spirituality and of certain truths of Christianity which transcend both Spain and Catholicism.

R. N

WHOSE WHO

Paul Tillich is professor of philosophical theology at Union Seminary.

Eduard Heimann is professor of economics of the Graduate Faculty of the New School of Social Research.

Marvin Halverson is a student at the Chicago Theological Seminary.

W. Pauck is professor of church history at the Chicago Theological Seminary.

Clifford Stanley is rector of Christ Church, Cape Girardeau, Mo.

R. A. Landor is a young layman and a member of the Fellowship.

Richard Day is chaplain of Bard College.